

F8 F85
1856

J. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C041624946

The Bancroft Library

University of California • Berkeley

THE PETER AND ROSELL HARVEY

MEMORIAL FUND

FREMONT'S ROMANISM ESTABLISHED.

ACKNOWLEDGED BY ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.

HOW FREMONT'S NOMINATION WAS BROUGHT ABOUT.

Hughes, Seward, Fremont, and the Foreigners—a most foul coalition.

We have linked together the names of Bishop Hughes, Wm. H. Seward, and John C. Fremont, and charge upon this trio a most foul coalition, a coalition which was projected in the city of Washington by the Seward politicians, the friends and advisers of Fremont, and the agents of Bishop Hughes, during the past spring, and which has been covered up, concealed, and hidden from the people until its consummation was realized, their mutual pledges to each other fulfilled, and the object for which it was concocted seemed almost within their grasp. For months past the Republican leaders have been accustomed to assemble, night after night, in their rooms in that city; and there discuss the merits and prospects of their various aspirants for the presidency, and to arrange the details of the campaign.

Among these political tricksters and Garrison Abolitionists, Seward had many enthusiastic admirers, Chase had his friends, McLean his supporters, Banks his lukewarm followers, and here and there was a Haleite. These were the five prominent aspirers for the nomination by the Philadelphia Republican Convention, which finally chose for its standard-bearers, Fremont and Dayton. Seward was the choice of the majority of the Republicans who nightly assembled in that city. He was regarded as the founder of this faction, the genuine exponent of its principles, and as the fittest bearer of its flag, which was to be unfurled throughout the north.

The elements of his strength consisted in the union of the Abolitionists and the Foreigners under the lead of Bishop Hughes, and for a while his nomination seemed certain, but the state elections of Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and various municipal elections throughout the north, demonstrated so clearly the strength of the North American vote, and so clearly the utter hopelessness of carrying Mr. Seward unless this American vote could be inveigled into the support of the Republican nominee, that he (Seward) was abandoned because of his anti-American sentiments, and his known affiliation with Archbishop Hughes. The Republicans had earnestly desired a union of the Abolitionists, Foreigners, and Americans north. Without a union in these elements, in opposition to the ruling dynasty, they could not hope for success, and that union upon Seward being impossible, he was abandoned. Then came Chase. He was the governor of the great state of Ohio, and in the election which had terminated in his success there had been a perfect union of the Abolitionists and Foreigners, with a large portion of the Ohio Americans under the lead of Thomas H. Ford.

Upon him for a time the union of these elements seemed practicable; but when it became perfectly understood that Chase was a violent opponent of American doctrines, and that the Ohio Americans had been inveigled into his support by that arch trickster and political game-player, Thomas H. Ford, and

that since the election, Chase had denounced their tenets, and deceived them, he, too, was abandoned. Next on the list was Banks. Upon him there could be no union. Bishop Hughes could not unite in the support of a Massachusetts Puritan. Puritanism he despised, abhorred, and denounced as a heresy, as an insult to his faith. Besides, Banks professed Americanism. Thus was N. P. Banks of Massachusetts, ruled off. With Hale all agreed there was no chance. He had in him no elements of popularity. Who then could be found as a standard-bearer for the united American and Catholic forces? It would not do to take one known as a Romanist; and the Catholics would not have an American or a leading Protestant.

The assembling of the Cincinnati Convention rapidly approached. The war between Douglas, Pierce and Buchanan was raging with fearful violence. Night after night the secret Republican conclave met. Seward, Chase and Hale, the true representatives of their principles, had been cast aside, and the partisan followers of each began to murmur; discontent became manifest. Philosopher Greeley and Chevalier Webb, seized this as the opportune moment to urge the claims of Seward. Day after day the columns of the Tribune and Courier teemed with their laudations of William H. Seward.

They applied the lash and attempted to whip his opponents into his support; Weed, of the Albany Journal, cried out for Seward. Just then the friends of McLean, who had been silent spectators of all that had transpired, presented his claims. His fugitive slave decisions were objected. They were met with letters avowing his adherence to the Republican doctrines. His long career of usefulness and his character as a jurist were prominently set forth. His non-identity with any party, or with any particular set of principles, his high moral character, and his long retirement from the strife and bickerings of political life, added to his personal popularity. He had many friends and few enemies. He had graced the legislative halls and the bench, and won for himself a world-wide reputation, and, though an American in his sympathies, he was the son of an Irishman. The name of McLean rang throughout the land, and his nomination seemed *then* a foregone conclusion.

But the friends of Seward and Chase were determined that the presidential honors should not be won by one so pure in morals and so just in all the private relations of life. Yet but few doubted McLean's nomination; his friends regarded it as a "fixed fact," and while they were passively awaiting the assembling of the convention, Seward and Chase were secretly devising and putting into operation their schemes to effect his defeat. McLean is a *Methodist and the President of a Bible Society*. These facts were sufficient to arouse the Archbishop's hostility. Webb was directed to continue to urge Seward's claims, and he did so up to the very last moment, even voting for him in the convention after his name had been withdrawn. His support for Seward was intended to conceal the effort directed at McLean. Greeley was directed to go for Fremont, who was first jocularly placed upon the presidential track, by a few political adventurers, and who was regarded as a weak and feeble man, more willing to bear honors than fit to grace the presidency. The scheme to defeat McLean was well devised. Fremont had no political antecedents, but had recently become a Republican. He is the son-in-law of Thomas H. Benton, was the son of a Catholic Frenchman, had been raised in the Catholic Church, was married by Father Van Horseigh, a foreign Roman Catholic priest, who was the pastor of St. Peter's Church in Washington city, and who died a few years ago. Fremont holds a pew in St. Mathew's Church. These circumstances rendered him particularly acceptable to Archbishop Hughes, and he cordially and with alacrity added his influence to that of Howard and Chase to secure the defeat of McLean.

Thus a man who in California had endeavored to establish the Democratic doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, and who during the 20 days he was in the U. S. Senate, voted always with the south, and twice against amendments of Messrs. Seward and Hale abolishing slavery in the District of Columbia,* is

* See Senate Journal of Sept. 12th and 18th, 1850.

put forward as the representative of north slavery sentiment at the north. Why was this done and the chiefs who had endured all the toil thrown aside? Let every American, every anti-slavery man ponder over this. Let him recall to mind what Jesuitism has done in the past, and see here but another of its deep laid schemes. This anti-slavery agitation is a mere cloud, under which it carries on its deadly designs against American Protestantism. Men's prejudices are to cement an unholy union between Catholicism and anti-slavery.

LOOK UPON JOHN C. FREMONT'S RECORD.

Let us take up the question of

FREMONT'S ROMANISM.

That John C. Fremont, is a Roman Catholic, no fair-minded man can deny, so long as he has before him

The Proof.

1st. His father was a Roman Catholic from France.

2d. He was educated at a Catholic institution, by the charity of Roman Catholic ladies.

3d. He was married by a Popish priest with whom marriage is a sacrament, not to be administered to heretics, and married in accordance with a license procured for the purpose, in which the name of the Popish priest was inserted at his own request.

4th. His adopted daughter was educated in a Catholic school.

These statements of facts we do not stop to prove because Mr. Fremont's friends or advocates do not deny them.

5th. It was well understood by the Catholics, before his nomination, that he was a Catholic.

The Boston Pilot, a Catholic paper, in speaking of the Bolting Convention, of the 12th June, in New York, part of which went over to the Republican Convention which at the time of the split was in session in Philadelphia says:

"If Fremont is nominated, we shall see the strange sight of this anti-Catholic, dark lantern, oath bound party nominating a Catholic and the son of a foreigner for the highest office in the gift of the people! For a Catholic to be put into the Presidential chair by the party whose only creed is hatred and persecution of Catholicity, will be in the world's history, like England's restoring Pope Pius VII to Rome, a proof that governments and parties are unwilling instruments in God's hands to use as he will."

6th. When in St. Louis he attended the Popish church, regularly as one of its members. A Catholic lady, member of the same church with him in St. Louis, now living at Sandy Hill, in N. Y. state, makes this statement, whose name Mr. Baker of the Sandy Hill Herald, will give to any one who wishes to test the truth of this assertion.

7th. *He goes to a Roman Catholic Church in Washington, crosses himself with so-called holy water at the door, and makes the sign of the cross when he goes into his pew.*

In proof of this Alderman Fulmer of New York, a gentleman of undoubted veracity, has published the following statement :

1st. That in 1852, he (Alderman Fulmer) and Col. Fremont were in Brown's Hotel, Washington city, together, and that then and there, he (Fulmer) first saw Fremont, and saw him then and there, daily and repeatedly, so that there could be no mistake as to identity.

2d. That he (Fulmer) being told that he (Fremont) was a Roman Catholic, doubted it for reasons not here necessary to name, and doubted it so earnestly, that it was affirmed and re-affirmed, whereupon he, himself, upon being informed proof of it existed in Col. Fremont's worshipping on the Sabbath in the Roman Catholic Cathedral, or church, went to that church to see and satisfy himself of the fact. He there saw Col. Fremont enter the church, and by or near the door, *cross himself with so-called holy water* as he entered, and he (Fremont) then passed up the center aisle of that church, to a slip or pew not far from the altar, or place where the priests were, *when he (Fremont) again crossed himself*, and took his place.

3d. That he (Fulmer) witnessed for some time the rites and ceremonies in the Roman Catholic Church in which Fremont was then worshipping, and that he (Fulmer) stayed there till the boys with the censers (so called) sprinkled incense (so called), whereupon he (Fulmer) left.

4th. That, on the same Sabbath, he dined at the same public table with Col. Fremont, in Brown's Hotel, at a sort of oval table, at which he was distant from him (Fremont) only some five or six persons, and then and there Col. Fremont, addressing those five or six persons unknown to him (Fulmer) between him (Fulmer), and Fremont dwelt upon the august rites and ceremonies of the church he had been that day attending, as if with a view to impress them therewith, and in so public manner, that he (Fulmer) felt it proper to ask him (Fremont) if he (Fremont) believed in TRANSUBSTANTIATION?

Whereupon he (Fremont) asked, "What I (Fulmer) understood by TRANSUBSTANTIATION?" when the conversation continued substantially as follows:

FULMER—I understand it to be the belief, that *the wafer which the Roman Catholics use in the sacrament, is substantially converted by the priests into the body of Jesus Christ.* Do you BELIEVE THAT?

FREMONT—I do.

FULMER—Did Christ ever have more than one body?

FREMONT—No. He had but one body.

FULMER—Do you believe that the body of Christ was crucified and was laid in the sepulchre of Joseph's tomb?

FREMONT—I believe it was.

FULMER—Do you believe that body after the resurrection was the body he ascended to heaven with?

FREMONT—I believe it was.

FULMER—Then what kind of a machine, hook, or knife, or pressure, does a bishop or priest make use of to obtain the body of Christ to convert into wafers at pleasure for the whole world?

Fremont, excited and appearing angry, made no reply, and in seeming indignation left the table.

Now, here are the points to take issue upon, and "by authority" we affirm this conversation and this scene to be true. As the Times has spoken "by authority" of Fremont through the editor, we await the reply of Fremont himself, when, if denied, we will substantiate these facts by oath or affidavit, and thus add to them that sanctity.

8th. When offered a Protestant book by a friend he refused to read it, on the ground of his being a Papist.

Prof. Wier of West Point, the person referred to, one of the most gifted and purest men of New York state, whose testimony no respectable man or paper, however friendly to Fremont dare question, has written two letters, the most guarded of which we give below. Mr. Gray a rabid Fremont man and who became greatly agitated in talking to Mr. Wier on the subject of Fremont's Catholicism, afterwards addressed him a note to which Prof. Wier replied.

WEST POINT, Aug. 27, 1856.

JOHN A. C. GRAY, Esq. Dear Sir : I have just received your notice of the 25th instant, in which you request a correct statement of the incident alluded to in an article that, appeared recently in the Troy Whig, and which I may add, was a publication of private remarks, made without my knowledge or consent.

The circumstance on which I presume the article was based, and which I stated to you in the cars was, that previous to Lieutenant Fremont's first visit to the Rocky Mountains, he came to West Point, and was introduced to me by a mutual friend, Lieut. Scammon. I was much interested in Lieutenant Fremont's youthful appearance, in connection with the arduous journey he was about prosecuting beyond the bounds of civilization, and offered him, through Lieutenant S., a little book that had been recently published by the Episcopal press, but whether a Prayer Book, or a Companion for the Altar, I can not now say, for it was some twelve or fourteen years ago, but it was courteously returned, with the intimation, through Mr. Scammon, that Lieutenant Fremont was a Romanist. This impression has always remained on my mind, and led me to make the remark that I presume has given rise to the article to which you refer.

As I should be very sorry to do an injury to any man, and as you think a correction is needed, I have no objection to your making what use you please of the above.

Very respectfully,

Your obed't serv't,

ROBERT W. WIER.

Here is the testimony of Mr. Fremont's own confession that he is a Romanist, not a mere general believer, but one of the strictest of the sect. It would not have been a great stretch of liberality on his part to have received this act of courtesy and kindness in the spirit in which it was offered, and no doubt it required an effort to repel it as he did. But he felt bound by the stern convictions of duty and the severe requirements of his religion, to refuse even the acceptance of a heretical book although he should never open it. No man can say that Mr. Scammon might have been mistaken. There could be no misunderstanding in a matter so delicate as this. There stands the testimony unimpeached and every just and honest man must accept it or overthrow it. We can not conceive of more direct and conclusive proof than this.

9th. Imitating other Roman Catholic explorers, in his expedition to the Rocky Mountains 1842, he made on Rock Independence, the sign of the cross, a thing that no Protestant explorer ever did or ever would do. See his own words in Congressional Document 166, of 1845.

After reaching the highest point, he says: "Here, not unmindful of the custom of early travelers and explorers in our country, I ENGRAVED on this

ROCK of the far west a symbol of the Christian faith. Among the thickly inscribed names, I made on the hard granite the impression of A LARGE



which I covered with a black preparation of India rubber, well calculated to resist the influence of wind and rain. It stands amidst the names of many who have long since found their way to the grave, and for whom the huge rock is a giant grave stone.

It is not necessary to stop here to prove what every intelligent reader already knows, that all Roman Catholic explorers, and none others, take possession of new countries with the cross as well as the flag—and if with either alone, with the cross. Much effort has been made to show that this proves nothing in favor of his religion—it being a mere symbol of Christianity. It is a sufficient answer to this, to say that no English or American Protestant explorer ever took possession of newly discovered lands with the cross before. Where true American pioneers go they plant the stars and stripes.

10th. Col. Russell, of the army, who slept for months under the same blanket with Fremont, declares that Fremont made to him no secret of his being a Romanist, and that of the fact there could be no doubt.

LETTER FROM HON. NATHAN SARGENT.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 2, 1856.

A. B. ELY, Esq.—Dear Sir: I have your note of the 28th July, inquiring where Col. William Russell of Missouri resides or may be addressed, and asking me what he has said, or will say, in reference to Col. Fremont's religious opinions?

Col. Russell's residence is at Harrisonville, Cass co., Mo.; but I am informed that he is at present in Baltimore on a visit.

Col. Russell is a man who will say what he has said; and he has said to me that Col. Fremont was a Catholic when he was in California. I spent an evening with Col. R. at Brown's Hotel two or three weeks ago, and knowing that he had been much with Col. F. in California, and on very intimate terms with him, I asked him if he knew anything of Col. Fremont's religious views at that time? He replied that he did; that he was with him a great deal, and in fact might say that he had slept under the same blanket with him for eight months. I then asked him what Col. F. was? He replied a Catholic. I asked him if he was sure of this? "Perfectly," he said; and then added, "Col. Fremont won't deny that he was a Catholic; everybody there so understood it, and he made no secret of it."

Further conversation occurred between us on the subject, but this is the sum and substance of it. I asked him if I might refer to this conversation and use his name? He replied, "certainly; you are at liberty to do so." But he again said, "COL. FREMONT WILL NOT DENY THAT HE WAS A CATHOLIC."

Col. Russell, you may not be aware, was Col. Fremont's principal witness on his trial before the court marshal. Should Col. Fremont deny over his

own signature that he was a Catholic when in California, I presume Col. Russell will then speak for himself.

Col. R. is an old, ardent personal friend of Henry Clay, with whose family his own is connected, his daughter having married Mr. Clay's grandson.

I am, very truly, your obedient servant,

N. SARGENT.

This has been published for a long time, and if untrue, why have we not had Col. Russell's denial. Mr. Sargent has been registrar of Pennsylvania, a gentleman of the highest standing, and no one has yet presumed to question his veracity.

11th. He was married by a Popish priest with whom marriage is a sacrament, not to be administered to heretics, and married in accordance with a license procured for the purpose, in which the name of the Popish priest was inserted at his own request.

It is said in reply to this that he could get no license and hence no other clergyman would marry him. This false assertion was nailed by obtaining the following certificate from the Clerk of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia:

"District of Columbia, Washington county, to wit:

"I, John A. Smith, Clerk of the Circuit Court of the District of Columbia, for the county of Washington, do hereby certify, that on the 19th of October, 1841, a license issued to unite in holy matrimony, John Charles Fremont and Jessie Ann Benton, as is manifest of record.

"In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name, and affixed the seal of said court, this 21st day of July, 1856.

[SEAL.]

"JOHN A. SMITH, Clerk."

Certificates of the baptism of Mr. Fremont's children by Rev. Mr. French, of the Episcopal Church, have been published to prove that the former was an Episcopalian. In reply to this Mr. French has written a private letter in which he states that, except that one occasion, he never saw Mr. Fremont in his church—that he always supposed he was a Roman Catholic and on that account never spoke with him on the subject of religion.

This settles at once that he was not an Episcopalian, and goes far to prove that he was a Romanist, for it is not to be supposed that Mr. French would be mistaken about the religion of a man whose children he was baptizing. If any one doubts the genuineness of this letter, he can be satisfied by calling on the editor of the Albany Statesman, who will show it to him with proof of its authenticity, or by writing to Mr. French himself. No honest man can persist in his denial of *this* fact, when the means of proving or disproving it are thus placed within his reach and he will not avail himself of them.

12th. Again it was stated in the Albany Statesman that Father Olivetti, a Roman Catholic priest had declared in public that Mr. Fremont he knew to be a Catholic, and on that account should vote for him and also induce the Catholics of that whole region to do the same. The Republicans afraid of the effect of this avowal persuaded Father Olivetti to play the Jesuit and deny in a *published letter over his own signature that he had ever made any such statement*. This, like every other attempt to crush the truth, ended only in making it more apparent. Gentlemen who heard the statement, indignant at the unblushing falsehood, came forward with the following statement and affidavit:

STATEMENT OF C. D. CULVER, ESQ.

SANDY HILL, Sept. 2, 1856.

Editor of the Albany Statesman:

DEAR SIR: My relation with Rev. Mr. Olivetti, having always been of the most friendly character personally, and being averse to newspaper controversies, or heated political discussions, I have endeavored to avoid any in this case.

Having, however, been shown an affidavit in which my name is mentioned in connection with a statement made by Mr. Olivetti (at Fort Edward on the 23d of August last), and which affidavit I understand is to be made public, I deem it entirely proper to state, that I was present on the occasion alluded to, and can only repeat here, what I have said before, when questioned in regard to the matter; that the Rev. Mr. Olivetti did say without reserve, that Mr. Fremont was a Catholic, and that he should vote, for him this fall. A gentleman who was with him, and who also appeared to be a Catholic priest, said to Mr. Olivetti, "You have never voted." "I know it, but I shall vote for Mr. Fremont this fall," was Mr. Olivetti's answer.

Very respectfully, yours,

C. D. CULVER.

C. D. Culver, Esq., is known to every one of our readers in this locality, and to nearly every one in this state. But for the benefit of those in other states, we would state that he is an eminent lawyer, a gentleman of unblemished character and high moral worth, a man of property, and an excellent and popular citizen. Now read the following

AFFIDAVIT OF CHARLES B. GUY.

Washington county, ss: Charles B. Guy, of Kingsbury, in said county, being duly sworn deposes and says, that he is well acquainted with Father Olivetti, a Catholic Priest, residing in Whitehall, in the county of Washington. That on the 23d day of August last, this deponent was with said Olivetti, James R. Gandall, C. D. Culver, and several other persons (one of whom was understood to be a Catholic priest, and was in company with said Olivetti), at the Fort Edward Railroad House kept by Joshua Eldridge, conversing on the subject of politics. That during that conversation the question was distinctly asked of said Olivetti, if the statement published in the newspapers asserting that he, Olivetti, had publicly said at Whitehall that Colonel Fremont was a Catholic, and he knew it and should vote for him, was true?

To this Olivetti replied, that he had said so at Whitehall, and had also said so in the cars last evening, and he should not deny it.

And at this deponent further says, that on the same day the said Olivetti, in Fort Edward, said he should vote for Col. Fremont, and his friends would vote for him, and added these words, "and we shall have him for our next president."

He also stated in substance that he had five hundred Catholic friends in Essex county whom he was going to see next week, relative to the presidential question. This deponent says there was much farther conversation on the same subject.

CHARLES B. GUY.

Subscribed and sworn to, before me, this 2d day of September, 1856:

L. H. NORTHROP, Justice of the Peace.

AFFIDAVIT OF J. R. GANDAL.

County of Washington, ss: James R. Gandal being duly sworn, says, that he is a resident of Fort Edward in said county, and is personally acquainted with Rev. Michael Olivetti, of Whitehall; that on the 23d day of August last, he was present at the Railroad House, in the village of Fort Edward, in company with the said Olivetti, Charles Guy, William W. Cronkhite, Charles D. Culver and others, when the following conversation was had.

In the first place, Mr. Cronkhite asked Mr. Olivetti if he had published in a Whitehall paper that John C. Fremont was a Catholic, to which Mr. Olivetti replied he had not. Mr. Cronkhite then said, "I thought I would ask you if you had said that John C. Fremont was a Catholic, knowing if you had said so, you would say so again," to which a person present, a stranger to this deponent (but said to be a Catholic clergyman, and who was in company with Mr. Olivetti), immediately said—"No, you deny it." Mr. Olivetti then said, "I have said it publicly in the street, and said so in the cars last night, and shall not deny it, but I did not authorize any publication of it," and added "I shall vote for him, and have my congregation vote for him, and we shall have him for our next president."

This deponent has a distinct recollection of the conversation above set forth and the same is true.

J. R. GANDAL.

Subscribed and sworn to this 2d day of September, 1856.

A. D. WAIT, County Judge of Washington County.

Both Mr. Guy and Mr. Gandal are well known citizens, men of high character and undoubted integrity, and their bare word would be taken by their neighbors before the oath of any Romish priest that ever drove a herd of Catholic Irishmen to the polls.

13th. Right on the top of this astounding development came the following

TESTIMONY OF AN OLD COMPANION-IN-ARMS.

The following letter speaks for itself, and adds proof on a point where further proof would seem to be useless. The writer, Mr. Busey, is a gentleman of respectability and standing in Washington, and the statement he makes, is worthy of all credit.

WASHINGTON CITY, Sept. 5, 1856.

DEAR SIR: I have just returned from a visit to Senator Clayton, where I met Judge Nathan Sargent, Thomas P. Trot (at present at the head of the depredation bureau of the General Post Office Department), and Capt. Edward Barry, formerly a captain in the army. We were conversing about political matters, and the subject of Fremont's Catholicism having been incidentally mentioned, Captain Barry remarked that he was surprised that any one doubted it, and stated that *he knew Fremont to be a Catholic*. Judge Sargent immediately enquired of him how he knew it? Captain Barry replied, *that he had seen him at Father Van Horseigh's church*; that when Col. Fremont resided in this city, a short time previous to his marriage to Miss Benton by Father Van Horseigh, he (Fremont) was in the habit of visiting at the house of a Mr. McCormick, now deceased; at which Barry met him—and that he *KNEW* the fact, of his own knowledge, that "Fremont was a regular attendant at Father Van Horseigh's Church, and a Roman Catholic."

This conversation took place in the presence of Mr. Trot, Mr. Clayton, Judge Sargent, and will be verified by either or all of these gentlemen; and if you desire their corroboration of the above, you can obtain it by addressing them. They are all in this city—Capt. Barry, Mr. Trot and Judge Sargent residing here.

Capt. Barry is well known in this community as a man of character and truth. He is not an American in politics, and hence can not be suspected of making this statement with any view to advance Mr. Fillmore's prospects. Nor did he do so with any intention that his statement should be communicated; but, it being important to show that the statements, or rather the contradictions of the Republican press are unfounded, and that Fremont is or was a Catholic, I have deemed it my duty to communicate the fact to you, and also give the names of those who were present, so that you might, if you need any corroboration, address them.

Yours truly,

To C. D. BRIGHAM.

S. C. BUSEY.

Again read the statement of Mr. B. F. Cook, made at Factoryville, Rich-

mond county, as reported in the Commercial Advertiser, and which has never been denied by any one over his own signature.

"Some friends having desired to enlist the speaker in the cause of so-called Republicanism, he expressed a desire to have all doubts removed on this mooted question, but said that nothing short of an assurance from Col. Fremont's own lips, would satisfy him. An interview was arranged for. The object of the visit being understood by the colonel, he avowed himself ready to answer any questions proposed. Mr. Cook proposed the following and received to each the answer annexed: "Were you married by a Roman Catholic priest?" *I was,* the colonel's lip quivered as he spoke. "Did you at the time believe in, or profess to believe in the Roman Catholic religion?" *I did not.*" "Have you before or since, or at any time professed the Roman Catholic religion?" *I have not.*" Here Mr. Cook bowed, to signify that he had no more questions to ask. Col. Fremont then volunteered some remarks to the following effect:—that while in California he attended no church, and that he occupied his Sundays in reading and writing, and in attending to such matters of business as he thought of importance. Mr. Fremont further said—"I am frequently interrogated by all parties on this subject. I presume the delegation now waiting for me up stairs wish to interrogate me on this point. When they do, I shall put the most favorable construction on the matter that I can. I wish to offend none, but to secure the votes of all. Only this very morning, I have a letter from Maine, saying that unless I make a personal denial of Romanism, and that I am or have been a Roman Catholic, that state will be lost to the Republicans; and another letter from Indiana, telling me that if I will authorize my friends there to say I am a Roman Catholic, they can secure for me a large German and Irish vote. I have to frame my replies so as to secure the votes of all. There is now a deputation waiting for me, whose errand I doubt not is the same. It is best to say as little about this matter as possible, and we must manage the thing as well as we can, so as to get the votes of both sides." Here the interview terminated. Mr. Cook's statement was listened to with profound interest."

State of New York, City and County of New York, ss:

Benjamin F. Cook, of said city, being duly sworn, says the foregoing statement of a conversation which took place at the residence of Hon. John C. Fremont, No. 56 Ninth street, in said city, about three weeks ago, between said John C. Fremont, J. L. Moffatt, Nathan Comstock, Jr., R. W. Potter, Isaac Sherman, and myself, is full and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. Signed, B. F. COOK.

Sworn to before me, Sept. 15, 1856. D. B. TAYLOR, Com'r of Deeds.

Now Fellow Citizens and Americans, we have not brought forward this mass of evidence to convince you that Mr. Fremont is a Catholic, because we have other testimony, that of itself alone puts it beyond a question. We present it to show how step by step the American party has labored to establish a truth that Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, the Tribune, Times and Evening Journal, were all the time aware of, but have determined the people should not know. They hoped to keep the people in doubt until after election and then smile at their credulity. When Archbishop Hughes, saw how much stronger party ambition was than Protestantism among Protestant clergymen and the leading papers of the state, and that a Popish president and the son of a foreigner, was just as good for them as a Protestant, he determined to throw off the mask and appeal to the Catholic vote of the country in a mass and at the same time show his utter scorn of those false hearted men who sought to obtain the Catholic vote by selecting a Catholic candidate and at the same time get the Protestant vote by asserting that he was a Protestant. If any thing can awaken in the heart of the honest masses an utter scorn and detestation of the Republican press and its unscrupulous editors the following editorial in the Freeman's Journal, Archbishop Hughes's paper of the 13th September, will do it. We take the liberty of dividing it into heads and underscoring it.

THE FACT SETTLED.

Archbishop Hughes's Contempt of Bolting Americans.

"RELIGION AS A POLITICAL TEST.—Were it not disgusting it would amuse us to see the savageness of the contest that has been waging for months between the two Know Nothing parties on the subject of the religion of the candidates of one of them. It was certainly of the nature of a farce that an out-and-out Know Nothing faction should have selected for their presidential candidate, not only the son of a foreigner, but one who, until recently, was looked upon by his friends and associates as a Catholic. The party known as Choctaws, North Americans, or anti-Slavery Know Nothings, offered Mr. Fremont their nomination, and he formally accepted it, having avowed his sympathy with most of their principles, and his purpose to carry them out if he could be elected. According to the New York Times, a Fremont paper, this convention which thus nominated Mr. Fremont, was composed of those "who bolted for the American (K. N.) National Council and nominating convention in Philadelphia, by reason of the admission therein of delegates representing a Roman Catholic constituency,—thus taking the most decided position as anti-Roman Catholics, and still maintaining that position." Yet, as if to illustrate how utterly profligate in principle Know Nothingism is, and how necessarily self-stultifying, they take as their candidate a man supposed to be a Catholic."

Declares Fremont a Romanist, and Charges on Weed, Greeley, Raymond, Beecher & Co., an Attempt to Deceive the People.

"Having selected such an one for their candidate, the next curious step is the attempt to make out,—not that Fremont had given up being a Catholic,—not that he was now a Protestant, or of no religion,—a thing possible in itself, plausible moreover, and which he certainly has the political right to do without being politically questioned about it,—but that he never had been a Catholic, never had so professed himself. This is, we think, the most audacious attempt on the credulity of the American people that has ever been tried. Had the appeal been made to the real American principle that a man's religion is not a matter on which he ought to submit to questioning—however contradictory this might be to the inquisitorial dicta of the Know Nothings,—their inconsistency would have found some to pardon it. BUT THE ATTEMPT TO MAKE THE PUBLIC SWALLOW SO ABSURD A STORY AS THAT MR. FREMONT DID NOT FOR YEARS PROFESS HIMSELF A ROMAN CATHOLIC,—AND NOTHING BUT A ROMAN CATHOLIC,—HAS ACTUALLY SOMETHING IN IT HARDLY ONE STEP FROM THE SUBLIME."

Compliments the Catholics, who could at any time have Nailed the Falshood on Beecher, Greeley & Co., for withholding their Testimony.

"There is a relieving feature in this unpleasant business. It is that while there are scores of men who, by personal intercourse with Mr. Fremont in other days, are in a condition to give the most conclusive testimony,—and many of these are hostile to Mr. Fremont politically,—not one of them of any character has been found to violate the rights of private intercourse, or the political privilege of religious liberty, so much as to be induced to publish a work on the subject. The unseemly contest has been left to the two Know Nothing factions to dispute between themselves. The one set averring—what Mr. Fremont does not, with his own word, aver,—that he has never professed himself a Roman Catholic,—the other set asserting that he has not ceased to be a Catholic, but is playing some dark and mysterious part for the accomplishment of Catholic designs on the country. The two sets are well matched. It would be a pity to interfere with them."

Rebukes Greeley for Accusing Father Van Horseigh of Violating his Oath in Marrying two Heretics.

"But we must insist on their letting alone the good name of the Catholic priesthood. *It will not do for the friends of Mr. Fremont to malign falsely the character of the good old Jesuit, Father Van Horseigh, who married him. Respect for the memory of a good priest, now deceased, will one day, compel the overhauling of the coarse charges of the Tribune, that he had no regard to the requirements of his sacred office.*" The same kind of gross impropriety has been practiced with a Catholic priest still living. The Rev. Mr. Olivetti, of Whitehall, in the diocese of Albany, has been trumpeted through the country as having declared that he knew Mr. Fremont to be a Catholic, and that he meant to vote for him on that account, and that he had five hundred men in Essex county whom he would make vote for him also. Mr. Olivetti has felt it proper to give a formal denial to this tissue of absurdities in a local paper of Whitehall. He says that he knows nothing about Mr. Fremont's religion—how should he?—that he has not had time to learn the merits of the political parties in this country, and does not intend to vote at all,—having enough to do with the discharge of his clerical duties. As to the retinue of five hundred men that were waiting for his word to vote, it is hard to think that such stories can be believed by any one. Catholics understand perfectly well their rights, and their individual responsibilities as citizens, and do not exercise their citizens' privilege at the dictation of any man. But the Catholic's conscience in such matters, its liberty and its dignity, is a thing not understood by Know Nothings who bind themselves to do blindly the bidding of the knights that carry the dark lantern for their party."

Regards with Equal Contempt and Scorn, the Know Nothings that Support Mr. Fremont, and those who Oppose Him.

"Meanwhile, as the Know Nothing faction that sustains Mr. Fremont repels as fatal to his prospects the charge of his having for years been known as a Catholic, and the Know Nothing faction that opposes him maintains that he is still a Catholic at heart, and only a Protestant for the nonce, till after election,—it gratifies us to witness the profound disgust with which a vast proportion of the community view this indecent discussion."

The Editor of the Organ of Bishop Hughes on the Stand!

The following Letter from the Editor of N. Y. *Freeman's Journal*, the Organ of Bishop Hughes, comes to us in the Columbus (Ohio,) *Capital City Fact*, of the 26th inst. It presents directly the issue of John C. Fremont's Veracity, and suggests before the nation the question—*Is not John C. Fremont guilty of deliberate, premeditated falsehood in denying his religious faith?* We ask men who would not countenance a deliberate falsifier, to read the following, which among honorable men will fall with crushing effect.

OFFICE OF THE N. Y. FREEMAN'S JOURNAL, Sept. 5th, 1856.

SIR:—No such article as you refer to has appeared in the *Freeman's Journal*—nor would I admit it, even to injure the prospects of the candidate of so bad a party as the Black Republicans—because the religion of Mr. Fremont, if he has any left, has nothing to do with his claims for office, or should have nothing to do with them at least.

What is more to the purpose, is the *personal veracity* of Mr. Fremont. If you can get any one to induce him to say over his own signature, what he seems to authorize his friends to say for him, viz: *that he has never professed to be a Catholic, THEN I WILL BRAND HIM PUBLICLY AS A LIAR*, as I know the whole story of his life in Washington, and know that daily, and for years, he professed to be a Catholic, and nothing but a Catholic. That he professed to be such when he was married. That he avowed himself such to his brother officers in the army, and to men in civil life—to Protestants and Catholics, whom I know and could cite as proofs. But J. C. Fremont dare not, over his own name, deny a fact that I can have sworn to by twenty

distinct affidavits of highly respectable people, men and women, priests and lay, Catholic and Protestant, viz: that for years he professed himself A CATHOLIC, AND DENIED HAVING ANY OTHER BELIEF IN ANY OTHER RELIGION.

A man who will LIE about a serious fact in his own history, ought to be denounced, if he pretends to run for President, even of so mean a coalition as Black Republicans and Choctaw Know Nothings. *If Col. Fremont will assert that he has never given himself out as a Catholic, I WILL CLAP THE HOT IRON ON HIM QUICK AND SURE.*

* * * * *

Yours, &c,

J. A. McMASTER.

Editor and Proprietor of Freeman's Journal.

THE BISHOP OF ST. LOUIS ON THE STAND!

From the St. Louis Pilot (Roman Catholic), Sept. 16.

That Fremont professed to be a Catholic and conformed to all the practices of that church, can be proved here by the most incontrovertible evidence. The following facts were related to us yesterday by a gentleman of this city who is perfectly cognizant of them, and was well acquainted with Fremont, with whom he was in the habit of daily association.

In the year 1838, Fremont spent the winter in St. Louis. He was at that time assistant engineer to Mr. Nicholas, who was employed by the government to make a topographical survey of Iowa and Minnesota. St. Louis was the headquarters of the surveying party in the winter. For the purpose of being near an open space from which he could take observations, Mr. Nicholas engaged rooms for his party at an hotel in Ferry's Building, adjoining Chouteau's Garden. Among the party was a young gentleman from New York by the name of Flaudrien, *who is still alive, and can testify to the truth of these facts.* Mr. Nicholas was a rigid Catholic, and died subsequently at the Jesuit College at Georgetown, in the District of Columbia. He exacted of the young men of his party, who professed to be Catholics, a rigid practice of the duties of their faith. FREMONT WENT REGULARLY TO CONFESSION, AND TO THE COMMUNION. A CLERGYMAN OF THE CATHEDRAL OF ST. LOUIS WAS HIS FATHER CONFESSOR, and all the Catholics in the city looked upon Fremont as in full communion with their church.

Our informant states that he was himself present at the table when the following incident occurred: A young Englishman who was traveling through the country, made some remarks of the most offensive nature reflecting upon the chastity of Catholic females. He was immediately taken up and *peremptorily challenged* by Fremont, on the ground that he had insulted *the ladies of his church*. No duel, however, took place, as the Englishman thought it best to leave the city at once.

As Fremont at this time of his life had no object to be gained thereby, he made no secret of his being a Catholic. He was married by a Catholic priest, he erected a cross on the summit of the Rocky Mountains, and in the most important acts of his life he passed himself off for a Catholic. Now he desires to conceal the fact; he allows his Black Republican organs at the North to deny it; he permits them to lie atrociously for him, and thereby becomes so far responsible. Such is the man whom the fanatics of New England seek to impose upon the people of the United States as President—one false to his religion and a traitor to the place of his birth.

From the St. Louis Leader (organ of Bishop Kendrick,) of September 16.

It would be affectation in us to keep silence in regard to what is said in this city on this question. That Fremont professed to be a Catholic when in St. Louis, admits not of a doubt. We understand that an evening cotemporary will publish some important facts on the subject this evening. We have certain further developments in reserve, and are only waiting for the permission of a third party to publish them. To be a Catholic is no disqualification for the office of President of the United States. But to be a Catholic and at the same time the candidate of the Know Nothings for the Presidency, is certainly a very curious combination. To be of ANY religion, and to suppress, or deny it, for fear of losing votes, is despicable. What is asserted is this. That when Fremont was here as a young engineer, he was considered a Catholic by his immediate employer, and the latter being a zealous one himself, took pains that the young men with him should practice their religion. A gentleman moreover, whose name can be produced, recollects an anecdote rather favorable to Fre-

mont, but bearing on this point. At table, in a hotel, an Englishman after dinner, gentlemen only present of course, uttered a most insulting opinion in regard to the chastity of Catholic women—and Fremont sent him a challenge, on the ground that he had insulted the members of his church. The Englishman vamosed. *Another gentleman vows that he saw Fremont at the altar rails of the Cathedral, but whether he received communion or not, can not be positive.*

In fact, our acquaintance lies among gentlemen who know him—mostly Catholics themselves (for the very first people in St. Louis, you know, are Catholics,—and it is a recommendation in best society) and we have yet to meet the first man who knew Fremont here, and did not regard him as a Catholic. We possess, however, evidence of a far more delicate and *recherche* nature, and if we are permitted, will publish it. Suffice it to say, at present, that it establishes in our mind the conviction that when here, among Catholics, and in Catholic CREOLE society, this then obscure young man passed himself off as a Catholic, professed at least to perform devotions peculiar to the Catholic Church, and rejected by all Protestants, and, in short, was either a Catholic or a hypocrite.

Letter from a Gentleman in California.

The following letter is from a man, formerly of Charlestown, in this State, (Mr. Jesse Morrill) and well known to the old members of the Order of United Americans. He was for many years in the employment of the Fitchburg Railroad Company, and was respected and esteemed by all who knew him. We know him personally, and have every reason to put implicit confidence in what he says:

SACRAMENTO, CAL., Aug. 19, 1856.

J. E. FARWELL, Esq.—Dear Sir: I see by some of the Eastern papers, there is some doubt about the religious opinions of Col. Fremont. As for that, I think I can put you right.

In November, 1849, learning that Col. Fremont was in attendance at the Roman Catholic Church, and having a desire, from curiosity, to see him, I followed. *I saw him go to the holy water, dip his finger in, and cross himself, and then go towards the altar and get down on his knees. During service I SAW HIM CROSS HIMSELF SEVERAL TIMES!!* I have since, on one occasion, SEEN HIM PARTAKE OF THE SACRAMENT IN THAT CHURCH.

* * * * *

I am yours &c.

J. MORRILL.

JOHN C. FREMONT'S PRO-SLAVERY PRINCIPLES.

John C. Fremont was in the U. S. Senate about twenty days. During that time he voted with extreme southern slavery propagandists. His course was undeviating and his action always in accordance with extreme southern policy.

The Proof.

On the 12th of September, 1850, a vote was taken on William H. Seward's bill providing that—"Slavery shall forever cease within the District of Columbia, and all persons held in bondage therein shall be free."

The vote on this proposition and substitute was:

AYES—CHASE (now Governor of Ohio); DODGE (of Wisconsin, Dem.); HALE (now, and again U. S. Senator); SEWARD (of N. Y.); and UPHAM, (of Vermont, now dead.)

NAYS.—MESSRS. Atchison, Badger, Baldwin, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Berrien, Bright, Butler, Clay, Davis of Mass., Davis of Miss., DAYTON, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Ewing, Felch, FREMONT, Green, Gwin, Hamlin, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mangum, Mason, Morton, Norris,

Pearce, Pratt, Rush, Sebastian, Shields, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turney, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb, and Winthrop—45.

See Senate Journal of 1850, p. 626.

Fremont's Second Vote was given for Slavery.

On the 18th September, 1850, Mr. Pratt, having moved to take up a bill to prevent the enticing or assisting slaves to escape from their owners in the District of Columbia. Mr. Hale moved *that the bill be committed to the committee on the District of Columbia, with the instructions so to amend it as to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.*

He is recorded as voting *against* Mr. Hale's motion, as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Baldwin, Chase, Davis of Mass., Dodge of Wis., Ewing, Hale, Hamlin, Seward and Winthrop—9.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Barnwell, Bell, Benton, Bright, Butler, Cass, Clay, Cooper, Davis of Miss., Dawson, DAYTON, Dickinson, Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Downs, Felch, Foot, FREMONT, Gwin, Houston, Hunter, Jones, King, Mason, Morton, Norris, Pratt, Sebastian, Shields, Smith, Soule, Spruance, Sturgeon, Turner, Underwood, Wales, Whitcomb and Yulee—40.

Fremont's Third Vote was given for Slavery.

Mr. Underwood, of Kentucky, having called up the bill for the relief of the American Colonization Society, which sought to repay the society the expenses for maintaining and sending to Liberia the slaves recaptured on the barque Pons, the motion was to ingross the bill for a third reading, and how did Freedom Shrieking Fremont vote! Look upon the damning record!

The question was discussed at length as to whether the United States would pay these just and legal demands; and on the vote being taken for the engrossment of the bill to a third reading, Mr. Fremont's name is found recorded in the *negative*—as follows:

YEAS—Messrs. Badger, Baldwin, Bell, Chase, Clayton, Davis of Mass., DAYTON, Dodge of Wis., Dodge of Iowa, Douglas, Ewing, Felch, Greene, Hale, Hamlin, Jones, Mangum, Pearce, Pratt, Seward, Shields, Smith, Spruance, Sturgeon, Underwood, Wales, Walker, Whitcomb and Winthrop—29.

NAYS—Messrs. Atchison, Barnwell, Benton, Butler, Dawson, Dickinson, Downs, FREMONT, Hunter, King, Mason, Rusk, Sebastian, Soule, Turner and Yulee—16.

[See Congressional Globe, vol. 21, part 2, page 1803.]

We wish in conclusion to show by a recent vote in Congress how honest these men are who condemn Mr. Fillmore for signing the Fugitive Slave Bill. It is well known that that law applied only to the *States*. The following is the article in the constitution under which the Fugitive Slave Law was passed:

“No person held to service in one *State* under the laws thereof, escaping into *another*, shall, in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.”—*U. S. Constitution, Art. IV, Sec. 2.*

It will be seen that this provision of the Constitution relates only to a slave escaping into a *State*, and makes no requirement respecting fugitives in the territories. When, therefore, a fugitive slave law is extended over the territory, it is not, as in the case of the States, because the Constitution positively commands it. Bearing this in mind, read the extract from an act which passed the House of Representatives on the 29th of July, 1856, by a vote of 88 yeas to 74 nays; *seventy-six of the eighty-eight yeas being given by members of the Republican party.* The part which we quote is known as Dunn's amendment:

Provided, however, That any person lawfully held to service in said Territories shall not be discharged from such service by such repeal and revival of said eighth section, if such person shall be permanently removed from such Territory or Territories prior to the first day of January, eighteen hundred and fifty-eight; and any child or children born in either of said Territories, of any female lawfully held to service, if in like manner removed without said Territories before the expiration of that date, shall not be, by reason of anything in this act emancipated from any service it might have owed had this act never been passed:

And provided further, That any person lawfully held to service in any other State or Territory of the United States, and escaping into either the Territory of Kansas or Nebraska, may be reclaimed and removed to the person or place where such service is due, under any law of the United States which shall be in force upon the subject.

It is only necessary to subjoin the names of the Republican members of the House, by whose votes this was passed, and the nail is driven and clinched. Here they are:

Charles J. Albright, Ohio; John Allison, Penn.; Lucian Barbour, Ind.; Samuel P. Benson, Me.; Philemon Biss, Ohio; Samuel C. Bradshaw, Penn.; Samuel Brenton, Ind.; James Buffinton, Mass.; James H. Campbell, Penn.; Lewis D. Campbell, Ohio; Calvin C. Schaffee, Mass.; Schuyler Colfax, Ind.; Linus B. Comins, Mass.; John Covode, Penn.; William Cumbach, Ind.; William S. Damrell, Mass.; Sidney Dean, Conn.; John Dick, Penn.; Edward Dodd, N. Y.; Nathaniel B. Durfee, R. I.; John R. Eddie, Penn.; J. Reace Emrie, Ohio; Thomas T. Flagler, N. Y.; Joshua R. Giddings, Ohio; William A. Gilbert, N. Y.; Amos P. Granger, N. Y.; Galusha A. Grow, Penn.; Robert B. Hall, Mass.; Aaron Harlan, Ohio; David P. Holloway, Ind.; Thomas R. Horton, N. Y.; Valentine B. Horton, Ohio; Jonas A. Hughston, N. Y.; William H. Kelsey, N. Y.; Rufus H. King, N. Y.; Chauncey L. Knapp, Mass.; Ebenezer Knowlton, Me.; James Knox, Ill.; John C. Kunkel; Orasmus B. Matteson, N. Y.; Killian Miller, N. Y.; Edwin B. Morgan, N. Y.; Justin S. Morrill, Vt.; Matthias H. Nichols, Ohio; Jesse O. Norton, Ill.; Andrew Oliver, N. Y.; John M. Parker, N. Y.; Guy R. Pelton, N. Y.; John J. Perry, Me.; John U. Pettit, Ind.; Benjamin Pringle, N. Y.; Samuel A. Purviance, Penn.; David Richie, Penn.; Alva Sabin, Vt.; Russel Sage, N. Y.; William R. Sapp, Ohio; John Sherman, Ohio; George A. Simmons, N. Y.; Francis E. Spinner, N. Y.; Benjamin Stanton, Ohio; James S. T. Stranghan, N. Y.; Mason W. Tappan, N. H.; Benjamin B. Thurston, R. I.; Lemuel Todd, Penn.; Mark Trafton, Mass.; Edward Wade, Ohio; Abram Wakeman, N. Y.; David S. Walbridge, Mich.; Henry Waldron, Mich.; Cadwallader C. Washburne, Wis.; Elhu B. Washburn, Ill.; Israel Washburn, Jr., Me.; Cooper K. Watson, Ohio; Wm. W. Welch; John M. Wood, Me.; John Woodruff, Conn.; James H. Woodsworth, Ill.

Here the Republicans who make such an outcry against Mr. Fillmore for signing a Fugitive Slave Law, the spirit of which is recognized by the constitution, vote for the same thing to be extended over a territory where the constitution never anticipated its extension. "Consistency is a jewel!"

Hollinger Con
pH 8.5